

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 12-23 remain pending in the present application. Claims 2, 10 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 6-9 and 12-23 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Svensson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,616). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 2, 10 and 11 and these claims have been cancelled. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to define that the control device stops the heating means at the time of starting the engine and displaces the movable member only by the pressure of the high-pressure gas.

Svensson does not disclose, teach, or suggest the movable member being displaced by only the pressure of the high-pressure gas.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 3, 4, 6-9, 12 and 15, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claims 2, 10 and 11 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svensson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,616) in view of Kelmar (U.S. Pat. No. 3,861,367). Claims 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svensson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,616) in view of Enderle, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,907,950). Claims 5, 13, 14 and 16-23 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 5, 13, 14 and 16-23 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2005

By: _____


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg